



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI

November 1918

NUMBER 7

PELLES, PELLINOR, AND PELLEAN IN THE OLD FRENCH ARTHURIAN ROMANCES

II. *Pellinor*.

I will say at once that, in my opinion, Pellinor is the invention of the author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation. Except as a variant in two MSS for the passage of the *Queste*, VI, 150, the name occurs only in the *Merlin* continuations of the Vulgate cycle, MS 337 and the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle (i.e., Huth *Merlin*, Spanish *Demanda*) and in the prose *Tristan*. Now, of these works the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation is unquestionably the earliest,¹ and it seems most natural to assume that the character was adopted from this branch by the rest. Indeed, only in the case of the *Merlin* of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle is the question debatable, and we shall return to that in a moment.

¹ Cf. E. Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXVIII (1905), 57 f., for relations of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 to that of the Vulgate cycle. *Ibid.*, XXIX (1905), 109, he expresses the opinion that the Huth *Merlin* is entirely independent of the Vulgate. So, too, G. Paris, p. lxiv of the Introduction to the Huth *Merlin* (Paris, 1886). But the pseudo-Robert cycle (to which the Huth *Merlin* belongs) with its *Tristan* contaminations, is certainly later than the Vulgate cycle. Observe, too, what I have said above, p. 113, note, on the lateness of this cycle as compared with the Vulgate. In his well-known treatise, *Über die verschiedenen Redaktionen des Robert von Borron zugeschriebenen Graal-Lancelot-Cyklus* (Halle, 1895), E. Wechssler assumes throughout that the Vulgate and the so-called Robert de Borron cycle are both derived from a common source—i.e., an antecedent cycle that has been lost—but he gives no proof of this assumption. He recognizes, however, explicitly (pp. 5, 18, *et passim*) that the prose *Tristan* influenced the second of the above-named cycles—hence was anterior to it. Later redactions of the *Tristan*, he thinks, were in turn influenced by the pseudo-Robert cycle.

The name first occurs in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, II, 125, where Brangoire, addressing the rebel kings about the Saxon invasion, says:

ne par decha du roy peiles de listenois natendons nous nul secors car il garde le roy pelinoir son frere qui gist malades dun mal dont iamais naura garison tant que cil vendra laiens qui les auentures du saint graal metera a fin. ne del roy alain qui gist malades natendons nous nul secors deuant ce que li mieudres cheualiers del monde uiegne a lui & li demant dont cele maladie li vint & quel chose li graus est que len sert.

And again we read (*ibid.*, II, 159) that Guinevere is the wisest, loveliest, and best-loved woman of "la bloie bretaigne," except "elaine sans per le feme persides le rous" and the daughter of Pelles. The text, however, which Sommer is following in his edition of the Vulgate cycle, is corrupt in this place, and we shall have to reproduce the reading of MS 747 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, as given by him in *Modern Philology*, V, 305. Here, too, it is said that only two women of her time were comparable to Guinevere, viz., "Helainne sans per qui fu feme persides le rous," and

la fille le roi pelles de listenois del chastel de corbenyc, qui fu niece le riche roi pescheor & le roi malade de plaies dont li uns ert apelez alains des illes an listenois. & cil ert malades de maladies de plaies & li riches rois qui estoit apelez mehaigniez estoit naurez parmi les .ii. cuisses de la lance uengeresse & fu apelez par son droit non quant il estoit en sante li rois pellinor de listenois. & li rois alains & li rois pelinor si furent frere germain & cele pucele dont ie uos di si estoit lor niece & fille le roi pelles qui frere (estoit) a ces .ii. dont ie uos ai dit. icele pucelle fu la plus bele que len ueist onques an la terre & la plus nete. icele garda le santisme graal iusquitel ior que galaad fu engendrez.

We find Pellinor still further in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation as the name of a brother of Pelles in the following passages, II, 359 (Pellinor de la saluage forest souuraine), where he is said to have had eleven sons of at least seventeen years of age, also a twelfth, who had not come to court, and the mother was now pregnant with the thirteenth, page 374 (Pellinor de Listenois), page 384 (Pellinor de la terre gaste). He is doubtless alluded to, though not named, in the following passages: II, 221, where a knight is described as kinsman

"al roy pelles de listenois & a ses freres," and II, 346, where he is described as Eliezer's uncle, wounded in the thighs.

What led the author of this *Merlin* continuation of the Vulgate cycle to invent the new brother of Pelles? In seeking an answer to this question one should remember that this branch is, as is generally agreed, the last part of the Vulgate cycle to be composed. The author, accordingly, had before him the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, in which (I, 252) Alain is called the *roi pescheor*, and, on the other hand, the prose *Lancelot* and *Queste*, in which Pelles was the *roi pescheor*. Furthermore, he had in his texts the *roi mahaigrie*, who was, generally speaking, not given a specific name in any of the branches of the cycle before the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation itself. The only exceptions in this vast extent of material are the following:

1. *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290, where in Sommer's text he is called Pelleam, although in the manuscript followed by Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, III, 295, he is son of Pelleam and unnamed. I shall return to this exception in the discussion of Pelleam's (Pelleian's) name.

2. Prose *Lancelot*, III, 29, where he is called Pelles. But this passage, with its *Queste* references, certainly did not belong to the *Lancelot* in its original form. It is an obvious interpolation and contains another gross blunder besides this identification of Pelles with the Maimed King, viz., in making Amide or Helizabel both Galahad's mother and his sister.

3. *Queste*, VI, 150. I have discussed this passage above.

The author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, therefore, found in his texts two *rois pescheors*, Alain and Pelles, and an unnamed *roi mahaigrie*. Pelles, however, was far more important in the Vulgate cycle than Alain, so that our author keeps Pelles as *roi pescheor*, and, despite his mystic title, as a king of the ordinary kind who guards the castle and the people in it. It was natural that he should do this, for this was, on the whole, Pelles' character in the prose *Lancelot*, and even in the *Queste*. On the other hand, he follows the general tendency of the later Arthurian romances to give a definite name to hitherto unnamed characters. Among innumerable examples of this tendency compare Galahad's mother, who, despite Sommer's side notes and the index to his edition of the Vulgate

cycle, is unnamed in that cycle, but is called Elaine in Malory.¹ So, too, the Maid of Ascalot first receives the specific name, Elaine, in Malory. In compliance with this tendency the Maimed King is given the name Pellinor, which is formed on the name of Pelles.²

Now, although our author takes Pelles as the Fisher King, he keeps Alain as a second Maimed King—doubtless, under the influence of Chrétien, in whose *Perceval*, as we have seen, there were really two Maimed Kings. Besides, the author of this *Merlin* continuation would be little disposed to drop any member of the Grail family, for it was his policy to crowd into his pages every Arthurian character of any prominence, as is evident from the enormous number of names which this branch of the cycle contains. And in addition to these considerations, he would have the powerful motive of establishing a trinity of Grail Kings to parallel that of the Christian Godhead. When Pellinor is provided with such an abundance of sons, this is in imitation of Bron, the first Fisher King in de Borron's *Joseph*³ and in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*.⁴

Finally, the author harmonizes the reconstituted Grail family by making Pelles, Pellinor, and Alain, brothers.⁵

¹ Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XL², 46, n. 10, offers an erroneous explanation of how the daughter of Pelles came to be called Helaine (Elaine). The true explanation is simple. In the passage of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, which compares Guinevere with Pelles' daughter and Helaine sans per and which I have just quoted according to the reading of MS 747, a scribe dropped out by mistake the *et* (or its symbol) which connected the names of the two heroines. In consequence of this error, we find the two already confounded in the Middle English version of the Vulgate *Merlin*. Cf. H. B. Wheatley's edition for the Early English Text Society (1865), Part I, p. 229.

² Brugger, *op. cit.*, p. 48, n. 11, has already suggested that the name Pellinor was arbitrarily fabricated in dependence on the name Pelles. Was the name of Virgil's pilot, Palinurus, in the author's mind? In such cases the mediaeval romancers regarded a general resemblance as sufficient. Cf. my discussion of the name, "Galahad," in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIII (1918), 129 ff.

³ Cf. G. Weidner's edition (Oppeln, 1881), p. 123. Bron had twelve sons.

⁴ Sommer's *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, I, 249. It was, no doubt, the example of Bron in the *Joseph*, that led the author of the *Perlesvaus* to make his Grail Knight, Perceval, one of twelve sons. It is true that he makes Bron's son, Alain (li Gros), father of the twelve sons, but in such shiftings the writers of Arthurian romance exercise complete freedom.

⁵ Alain occurs only once as Pelles' brother in the Vulgate cycle outside of the *Merlin* continuation, viz., in the *Lancelot*, III, 117. But the passage, since it contains allusions to the *Queste* and *Estoire*, could not have belonged originally to the *Lancelot*. It is an interpolation—taken, indeed, from the passage of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, II, 159, which I have quoted above from MS 747. To be sure, Sommer, *Modern Philology*, V, 305, and Brugger, *op. cit.*, p. 49, n. 11, are inclined to believe that the reverse is true. Sommer has, still further, injudiciously adopted in the *Queste*, VI, 102, the reading *Alain* instead of the true reading *Herlan* (son of Pierre, Alain's brother), which latter is found in

Pellinor, who was thus invented, as I maintain, by the author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, is found also in the *Merlin* continuation of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle, which is best represented by the Huth MS. There he is Perceval's father.¹ It is not likely, however, that the author of this new *Merlin* continuation derived the character directly from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation. G. Paris has asserted² that the Huth *Merlin* is entirely independent of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation and that the authors of these continuations executed them "sans se connaître."³ Perhaps, however, this last phrase is too strong. The author of the Huth *Merlin* may have ignored his predecessor's work, first, because the two authors, as Paris himself observes, pursued different aims, the author of the Vulgate version fashioning in his work an introduction to the *Lancelot*, the author of the Huth *Merlin* endeavoring to connect the *Merlin* of de Borron with the *Queste*. Second, because of the difference in the tendencies of the authors, which is about as great as could well be imagined. The Vulgate version is, for the most part, a pseudo-historical record of endless wars, in the style of the chronicles; the Huth *Merlin*, as befitted a work which belongs to the later development of Arthurian romance, is composed of romantic fictions of the most extravagant kind. The author of the latter was certainly familiar with all the other members of the Vulgate cycle—so how can we suppose him ignorant of the branch in which he would naturally be most interested, especially when that branch was one of the most widely diffused works of the Middle Ages? At any rate, Brugger's contention⁴ that, if the one author had known of the other's work, he would probably not have composed a new continuation is not

MSS M and R, and (with corrupt spellings) in still others that he cites. Nowhere else in the Arthurian romances is Alain given a son, *Argustes*, whereas we have in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 280, *Agristes* named as a descendant of Herlan.

¹ The passages bearing on this subject are I, 150, 160, 258, 260 f. We have here the same trick as in the description of Pelles in the *Lancelot* and *Queste*: one has to assemble these passages to make out clearly that Pellinor is Perceval's father. In the Spanish version of the *Merlin* continuation of this cycle Pellinor is also found. Cf. Bonilla's edition of the *Demanda*, pp. 124, 126, 137-44. He does not appear in the *Demanda* proper (i.e., the *Quest* section).

² Introduction to the Huth *Merlin*, p. lxiv.

³ So, too, Wechssler's above-quoted treatise, p. 5, and Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXIX, 109.

⁴ See passage cited in preceding note. I hope to show in a future article that the influence of the Vulgate *Merlin* is, after all, discernible in the Huth *Merlin*.

sustained by what we know of the methods of the Arthurian romancers; for, as a matter of fact, a new Mort Arthur section was composed for the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle, although the writer knew the Vulgate version well and used it largely, and, what is perhaps even more to the point, the author of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 composed his own work, though he was familiar with the corresponding Vulgate version, as Brugger himself has observed.¹ It seems to me most probable that the author of the Huth *Merlin* was incited to write his branch of the new cycle by the Vulgate version, the author of which also ascribed his work to Robert de Borron, but for the reasons recited, gave his narrative an altogether different turn.

To come back, however, to the question of Pellinor in the Huth *Merlin*, the character was derived, no doubt, by the author of that romance from the prose *Tristan*. The influence of the latter romance, as Wechssler (p. 5) has set forth, is the distinguishing mark of this cycle, as compared with the Vulgate, and we have, I believe, in the matter now before us, one of the manifestations of this influence. In the prose *Tristan*, too, Pellinor was Perceval's father, and it was no doubt the author of this romance who originally conferred on him that honor.² The author of the *Tristan* took this particular name from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation and gave it to Perceval's father, most likely because Pellinor was there connected with the Grail as a Grail King, just as Perceval was the Grail Knight in other romances. The Grail attributes of Pellinor, however, if we may judge by Löseth's analysis, are effaced in the brief passages concerning him in the *Tristan*, which mainly relate to his death, and this, no doubt, is the reason why the same thing is true of the character in the Huth *Merlin*. The connection of the main passage in the prose *Tristan* about Pellinor (Löseth, p. 234) with the Huth *Merlin*, I, 261, is too obvious for dispute. In both we have Gawain figuring as the slayer of Pellinor (who had slain Gawain's father) and the enemy of his sons. Under these circumstances, to explain Pellinor's

¹ *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXVIII (1905), 57.

² The writers of the Arthurian romances were not bound by tradition in naming the fathers of their heroes. In the extant romances six different names (not reckoning scribal variants) are given to Perceval's father. See Miss J. L. Weston's *Legend of Sir Perceval* (London, 1906), I, 60 ff.

part in the Huth *Merlin*, there is no need of resorting to the theory of lost cycles.

Pellinor appears again in the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337. Indeed, the peculiarity of this work is that it contains not merely one Pellinor but two. The one is the original Pellinor (as we may call him) of the Vulgate, the brother of Pelles; but there is an additional Pellinor, *not* a brother of Pelles, who, it is true, assumes the attributes of the original Pellinor, including his multitude of sons. Sommer has erroneously asserted¹ that it is the first and original Pellinor, the brother of Pelles and Alain, whom the author of this *Merlin* continuation makes the father of Perceval. But it is the second Pellinor, the *cousin* of Pelles and Alain, who is here Perceval's father. This is perfectly clear from the passages that relate to this subject in the text. Perceval's father in these passages is both *roi pescheor* and *roi mahaignie*. The following account is given, VII, 243, of the circumstances under which he became maimed:

Il auint un soir que li rois Pellinor li peres Perceual se gisoit en son lit & pensa molt durement a merueilles que il auoit oi retraire paroles du Saint Graal & tant qui(l) les comenca a mescroire. & endementres que il saloit desesperant si uint une lance toute ardant deuers le ciel toute en flambe bruiant come foudre si le feri si durement parmi outre les cuisses ambedeus tres parmi sa robe dom il estoit couerz que tout cousi luj & son lit a la terre dure & lors li dist une uoiz au resachier hors quele fist de la lance. cest li uengemenz de ce que tu as mes oeures mescreues & moi deshonore par ta pensee fole & mauese & por ce que tu es cil que iauoie tant essaucie de lignage sor toz autres lignages & que ge tauoie baillie en garde mon sanc & ma char & tu ten desesperoies por ce le te ferai ge si comparer que toz les iors que tu uiuras ten memberra & le ior que tu garras rendras lame du cors. tu soloies auoir non li rois de la Gaste Forest Soutaine or auras non li rois peschierres car petit auras de sante se lors non que tu seras en riuere. & le ior que Pellinor tes cosins gara tu garras & morras. & par ce que tu as mescreu mes miracles que ge demonstroie par cest pais por ce sera tes filz Perceual reusez dauoir le Graal en sa garde iusque apres la mort au fill de la fille le roi Pelles car se tes pechiez ne fust de ce que mescreu as tes filz leust auant en garde.

In consequence of his wounds, if he wished to divert himself or go anywhere, like Chrétien's *roi pescheor* (*Perceval*, pp. 3470 ff.), he resorted to a boat. In the paragraph just before this the companions of Agloval (*Perceval's* brother) lament with him over the

¹ *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, VII, 146, n. 1; 243, n. 1.

slaying of his brothers and after expressing their compassion for his mother add:

de uostre pere ne di ge mie, fait chascuns, car toz ses deporz sunt en soi faire nagier parmi ces riuieres granz & parfondez por oblier ses plaies & sa dolor entre luj & le roi Alain son cosin & le roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenic.

Compare, too, VII, 244, where Perceval's father, hearing of the death of his fourteen sons,

ne uost onques puis estre en son recet einz sen ala seiornier u Chastel de la Merueille auec la mere au roi Artus que Merlins i auoit portee mes nu sauoient nules genz fors cil qui le Saintisme Graal auoient en garde. & aloit souent naiant en une nef enuiron le chastel par la riuere qui grant estoit (&) qui duroit iusquau chastel de Corbenic & iusquau chastel au roi Alain ilec ou il manoit. & saloient dedui(s)ant par leue de chastel en chastel por ce que mahaigie estoient par lor pechie de la lance meismes dom Ioseph d'Abaramathie fu nauurez en la hanche a la cite d' Orberique ilec ou il laissa la gent paienne a baptizier por rescorre la gent a lenemi qui les aloit ociant defors la cite.

These passages agree perfectly—in part, even in phrasing—with the description which is given of the second Pellinor, the cousin of Pelles and Alain, in this text. Cf. VII, 146, which runs as follows:

Après ce que Gale(h)ot ot les viij. princes conquis si entra u roiaume au roi Alain le frere au roi Pellinor & le frere au roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenic qui cosin germain estoient au roi Pellinor le roi mahaigie de la cuisse de la lance ue(n)cheresse que li contes apele le riche roi pescheor por ce quil ne pooit nule foiz cheuauchier ainz le couenoit toz iors mener en nef quant il remuoit de leu en autre por le saint seruise oir que li sainz esperiz i faisoit chascun ior de la soe saintisme boche & donoit son sacrement a touz cels qui a la table seoient & asouisoit cuer dome & pensee plus que il ne seust penser tant com il fust a cele table. ne ne seoient a cele table a ce tans de lors nule foiz fors solement li rois Pellinor qui fu peres Perceual qui encores nauoit que demi an & li rois Alains qui estoit ausinc naurez de la lance desferree & Pellinor (qui) fu naurez a tout le fer. & li rois qui nule foiz ne leuoit dont li contes a molt parle u commencement Mordrains li rois de Sarraz qui ne uiuoit mais solement de loiste sacree que li angle le metoit chascun ior en la bouche & ne uiuoit dautre chose.¹

The distinction between the first Pellinor and the second is maintained, besides, in VII, 237, from which we learn, furthermore,

¹ There is a similar description of Perceval's father, but very brief, in VII, 236.

that the first Pellinor was Perceval's uncle (his mother's brother), as the second Pellinor was his father. The passage reads:

Agloual [Perceval's brother] demanda se ses peres estoit nes point asoagie & la mere dist. biaux filz coment asoagera il. ia ne se demostrent mie encore les auentures du graal par quoi il doit garison auoir. & uostre freres roi Pel(l)inor du chastel de Corbenic coment le fait il. & el(e) li dist si com ele seust.

There is accordingly no contradiction whatever in this romance, as Sommer imagines,¹ when Alain is called cousin of Perceval's father.

The explanation of the two Pellinors in this *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 is that the writer has adopted the Pellinors, respectively, of both the Vulgate *Merlin* and prose *Tristan* and given each of them a place in connection with the Grail. The Pellinor of the *Tristan*, Perceval's father and a secular figure, assumes, however, in our text as I have already remarked, the attributes of his namesake, the Grail King of the Vulgate, and himself becomes a Grail King. Like the Vulgate Pellinor, he had been wounded by the avenging lance and had a multitude of sons. On the other hand, under the influence of Chrétien's *Perceval* (ll. 6377 ff.) our author makes Perceval a nephew, through his mother, of the three Grail Kings that were taken over from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, just as in that poem he had been, through his mother, a nephew of the mysterious Grail King, father of the *roi pescheor*. He becomes here, accordingly, a maternal nephew of the Vulgate Pellinor. The retention of the two Pellinors is due to the author's desire to sweep into his net as many Grail Kings as possible. In the above-quoted passage we see him including in the company of the Grail table even Mordrain, who had never been definitely identified with either Fisher King or Maimed King, although in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 241, and in the *Queste*, VI, 62 ff., he had suffered much the same fate as the Maimed King.²

¹ VII, 243, n. 1.

² E. Freymond, *Zeitschr. für roman. Phil.*, XVI, 106, is greatly puzzled by the Pellinors of this romance, but he does not seem to me to have brought any light into the matter. In the *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XVII, 100, n. 2, he recognizes, however, that MS 337 is here in agreement with the Huth *Merlin*, Portuguese *Demanda*, and prose *Tristan*, as to Pellinor's being the name of Perceval's father.

We face here, it is true, the difficulty that the author of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 does not in other points, as far as I am aware, show dependence on the prose *Tristan*. But in the *Tristan*, a work of universal fame in the Middle Ages, Pellinor is the name of Perceval's father, and, in view of this fact, there seems no need of resorting to hypothetical sources for this conception in the comparatively late text now under consideration. The author might not have any intimate acquaintance with that romance and yet derive from it, indirectly, perhaps, the conception that Perceval's father was so named.

Pellinor does not appear in either the Didot *Perceval* or the *Perlesvaus*.

III. *Pellean* (*Pelleam*, *Pellehan*, *Pellehem*).

This name—it is impossible to say with certainty which variant is the original one—does not occur at all in the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337, and in the whole Vulgate cycle it occurs only twice, viz., in the *Queste*, VI, 144, though not in all MSS, and in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290. To what extent it is found in the MSS of the latter passage we are unable to say, since collations of the MSS of the *Estoire* are wanting. In any event, considering the close relations of *Queste* and *Estoire*, the name, no doubt, passed directly from the manuscripts of the one romance into those of the other, and so, in all likelihood, we are really not confronted here with two different sources of independent value.

Take first the *Queste* passage. Most of the MSS, Sommer tells us (*ibid.*, n. 9) make Perceval's sister say to him at this point: "ie sui uostre seur & fille al roi Pellehem [or Pellean and other variant spellings]."

Inasmuch as Sommer names only five of the MSS which have the name Pellehem or Pellean in this place, we cannot determine whether the weight of manuscript authority, reckoning not merely by numbers, supports this as the true reading. M, which is, generally speaking, the best MS for the latter part of the Vulgate cycle, has here merely: "ie sui uostre seur," and "others, e.g., No. 343, *Bibl. Nat.*, and No. 4377 Phillip's (*sic*) collection, agree with M," as Sommer himself says. Perhaps M is right in the present passage, as it

certainly is in the *Mort Artu*, where, as against the overwhelming majority of MSS, it makes Morgan le Fay the chief lady of the ship which bears the wounded Arthur away to Avalon: see the record of the MS readings in my edition of the *Mort Artu* (p. 250, n. 2). In any case, no importance can be attached to this name, which occurs here alone (and not in all MSS) in the whole range of Arthurian romance as that of Perceval's father. Whether the scribe who was in the first instance responsible for the name in the present passage took it from the *Estoire*, I, 290, or as I believe, vice versa, it is, in any event and in all probability, simply the distortion of some one of the names of Perceval's father which we find in the other romances—most likely of Pellinor, who in the Huth *Merlin*, Portuguese *Demanda*, *Merlin* continuation of MS 337, and prose *Tristan* is that hero's father. It is to be noted that each is king of Listenois. For Pellinor cf. Vulgate *Merlin* (II, 346, 374), *Tristan* (pp. 38, 155, etc.), for Pellean cf. Huth *Merlin* (II, 30) and Spanish *Demanda* (pp. 107, 111). *Pellean* for *Pellinor* (the Portuguese *Demanda* in the corresponding passage actually has *Pellinor*) is a mild corruption for a mediaeval scribe, as unnumbered examples in the MSS of the Arthurian romances themselves—to go no further—sufficiently prove.¹ In MS A at this point we have not *Pellean* (*Pelleam*) or *Pellehem*, but merely *Pelle*; and the name Pellinor was easily subject to corruption, if the -or were written above the line, as is often the case in mediaeval MSS, and in an illegible hand. In the *Perlesvaus* MSS the name of Perceval's father (*nota bene!*), which was *Alain*, becomes distorted to *Julien*, *Julain*, *Vilain*.² The *Brulans* of the *Estoire*, I, 290, becomes *Urlains* in *Queste*, VI, 147. New characters occasionally come into existence in such instances through the failure of subsequent writers to recognize that the new names are merely manuscript corruptions of old ones. The best-known instance in the Arthurian romances is in the case of Gawain's brothers, Gaheries and Guerrehes. One of these names is merely a manuscript

¹ The fact is too well known to require illustration. Cf., for example, the variants in Sommer's Index or in E. Langlois' *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de geste* (Paris, 1904), or in such an edition as that of the *Roman de Troie* by L. Constans (Paris, 1904-12) where all variants are recorded from the numerous MSS.

² Cf. W. A. Nitze's *Perlesvaus* dissertation, p. 110.

variation of the other.¹ They came to be accepted, however, as the names of separate characters, and, as such, run all through Arthurian romance. The Huth MS of Robert's *Merlin*, I, 120, somewhat in the same fashion and doubtless through a misunderstanding, makes two sisters out of Morgan le Fay, accepting for one the nominative form of her name, *Morgue(s)*, for the other the objective form, *Morgan(=Morgain)*. In *Escanor* (ll. 14365, 14389, 18857 ff.) new characters are created out of variants of Perceval's name (Percevaus, Pellesvaus). In consequence of MS corruptions of the name "Helins li Blons" (including the epithet), the scribes of the prose *Lancelot* have called into existence three brothers of the same name, only distinguished by varying corruptions of the original epithet; cf. Sommer's index under "Helys li Blois." The *Brulans* of the *Estoire*, mentioned above, yields in the same way *Garlans* in the Huth *Merlin*, II, 21 ff., who there plays a more extended rôle than Brulans did in the *Estoire*, although the connection with the dolorous stroke incident and the similarity to the corrupt variant, *Varlans*, recorded by Sommer (Index), prove that the two characters are certainly identical. Nearest of all to the corruption which I suppose in the case of Pellean's name are the variants for the name of the Grail Castle in Malory's *Morte Darthur*. In the *Queste* section of his work (e.g., pp. 644, 690, 717, in Sommer's edition) this name always appears as *Carbone(c)k*, in the *Lancelot* section (e.g., pp. 575, 580, 603), as *Corbyn*. The difference was probably already in Malory's French MSS. The loss of the last syllable here is just the same as I postulate in the case of *Pellean*.

Having finished with *Queste*, VI, 144, let us turn now to the passage in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290. The passage in the MS which Sommer reproduces reads as follows:

Après le roy Iambor [i.e., the descendant of Bron whom the pagan king, Brulans, had slain with King David's sword] regna li rois pelleam son fil,

¹ On this subject see Miss J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 247, n. 2, and E. Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXXI (1907), 144 ff. In the H. Morf *Festschrift* (Halle, 1905), p. 83, the latter remarks on this phenomenon, but his examples are not very satisfactory.

A good example, outside of the Arthurian romances, is the creation by manuscript alteration of a new divinity, *Demogorgon*, out of *demiourgon* (Plato's demiurge) in the commentary on Statius (*Thebais*, IV, 516) by Lactantius Placidus; cf. G. Knaack, *Zeitschr. für vergleich. Literaturgeschichte, Neue Folge*, XII, 22 ff. From Boccaccio to Shelley this spurious divinity has cut no insignificant figure in literature. Not one of Shelley's editors has recognized the true origin of the character.

qui fu mahaig(nie) de .ij. cuisses en vne bataille de rome & pour le mah(a)ig quil rechut en cele bataille lapelerent tuit cil qui le connurent le roy mahaig(nie) por ce quil ne pot garir de la plaie deuant ce que galaad le tres bon cheualier le uendra uisiter. Mais lors sans faille sera il garis. Et de celui descendoit vns rois qui ot a non pelles, biaux cheualiers & preus durement.

The passage goes on to say that Galahad, son of Pelles' daughter, brought to an end the adventures of the Holy Grail. On the other hand, in the MS followed by Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, III, 295, the passage reads:

Apries le roy Lambor regna Pellehans et ses fieus qui fu mahaig(nie), etc.

Probably, however, Sommer's text is correct, and the *et* (or its symbol) after *Pellehans* in Hucher's MS was an unwarranted insertion. Similarly, in the *Queste*, VI, 185, MS R (cf. Sommer, n. 11), by the insertion of "&," makes two persons out of the elder Galahad, king of Hozelice.

Now the *Estoire*, as Arthurian scholars (except Heinzel, pp. 129 f.) are pretty generally agreed, is later than the *Queste*, although in the extant MSS they have been reciprocally adjusted to each other. Its author, then, doubtless derived this name from some MS of the *Queste* that had the reading *Pellean* (*Pellehan*) in the present passage. It is to be observed, however, that in the *Estoire* the name is given not to the father of Perceval, but to the father of Pelles—identified here with the (generally) unnamed *roi mahaig(nie)*. With this discrepancy, it does no good to assume a lost common source. We are confronted simply with one of the arbitrary namings (or shiftings of relationship) of subordinate characters of the Grail cycle¹ which we meet with everywhere in the Grail romances. Either the author of the *Estoire*, as suggested above, or a scribe—in the absence of MS collations, we cannot say which—applied the name of a king connected in a *Queste* MS with the Grail circle to another king connected with the Grail circle. He may have done it deliberately or he may have done it through a confusion of memory. Either is possible.

It should be repeated that nowhere except in the *Queste* passage discussed above does Pellean appear again as Perceval's father.

¹ We have seen, for instance, that Perceval's father bears six different names in as many romances. Galahad's mother is called in *Lancelot*, III, 29, Amite (with variant spellings) or Helizabel—in the English *Merlin* and Malory, Elaine. And so on.

The character, who, as I have maintained, owes his existence to a scribal blunder, passed into the pseudo-Robert cycle (Huth *Merlin*,¹ Spanish *Demanda*²)—probably from the above-quoted passage of the *Estoire*, I, 290—but he is not Perceval's father in that cycle and he plays there an insignificant rôle, which surely does not comport with the supposition that he had ever been accepted seriously as Perceval's father.

The name does not occur in the Didot *Perceval* or in the *Perlesvaus*, and in the prose *Tristan* we find it merely as an unauthorized MS variant for *Pelles* in one passage (Löseth, p. 250).³

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

¹ II, 7, 21–28. The Huth MS is, unfortunately, defective in this episode (pp. 21–28), the only one in which Pellean appears as an actor. Paris, *ibid.*, II, 27, n. 1, summarizes the corresponding passage in Malory.

² Bonilla's edition, pp. 107–11.

³ Before leaving the subject, I should say that Sommer has proposed in *Romania*, XXXVI (1907), 552, an etymology for *Pellehem*, *Pellean*, etc., viz., *Pel-alein* or *Pel-helain*, which would be a combination of *Pelles* and *Alain*.

Nitze, in his well-known article, "The Fisher King in the Grail Romances," *PMLA*, XXIV (1909), 379, n. 2, appears to have arrived at the same etymology independently. Owing, however, to the conditions which I have analyzed above, the explanation which I have offered seems to me preferable.

After the first section of this article had passed through the press, I observed that A. N. Wesselofsky, *Archiv für Slavische Philologie*, XXIII (1901), 374 f., had already proposed to derive *Pelles* from *Peleus* (*Pelleus*), but on grounds which I cannot accept. He makes the impossible identification of *Pelles* with *Pellean*, who, as we have seen, suffered the dolorous stroke, and then identifies the spear of this stroke with the spear which, according to the classical legend, the centaur Cheiron gave to *Peleus* and which is commonly known as the spear of Achilles (son of *Peleus*). This spear had the power of healing the wound which it inflicted.